



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,336	05/08/2001	James Duncan Work	4938P001	4814
26263	7590	03/10/2006		
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			EXAMINER	CHEA, PHILIP J
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,336	WORK, JAMES DUNCAN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Philip J. Chea	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 148-152,155,156,158,161,162,164-166 and 169-175 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 148-152,155,156,158,161,162,164-166 and 169-175 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to a Request for Continued Examination submitted December, 23, 2005. Claims 148-152,155-156,158,161-162,164-166,169-175 are currently pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim 148 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson et al. (US 2004/0167813), herein referred to as Robertson.

As per claim 148, Robertson discloses a computer implemented method, comprising reporting matches to searches initiated by a searcher so long as access control criteria are met (see page 8, paragraph [0103]), the searches, and the access control criteria (i) being selectively controllable by any of one or more persons in one or more chains of person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential targets each of the chains of person-to-person relationships including at least three person-to-person connections (see Fig. 13), and (ii) defining attributes of said one or more persons and said one or more persons' contacts that may be shared with others; and so long as said reporting is not precluded by any of the one or more persons in the chain of person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential target to which each of the matches pertain (see page 8, paragraph [0104]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 149-152,155,156,158,164,165 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson (US 6,092,197) as applied to claim 148 above, and further in view of Kautz et al. ("The Hidden Web"), herein referred to as Kautz.

As per claim 149, although the system disclosed by Robertson shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose connection strengths for person-to-person relationships and wherein said search criteria defines a minimum connection strength for a person-to-person relationship that is required between persons forming said one or more chains of person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential targets.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Robertson, as evidenced by Kautz.

In an analogous art, Kautz discloses reporting matches for a searcher looking for a target within a minimum specified connection strength (see page 32, paragraph 24). The Examiner interprets connection strength as how closely linked the searcher is to the target. In this case, asking a colleague what they know about something indicates a high connection strength.

Given the teaching of Kautz, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Robertson by allowing a searcher to find a target within a radius of person-to-person connections, such as disclosed by Kautz, in order to find a target that is within a certain.

As per claim 150, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that at least one attribute defined by the access control criteria comprises an indication of a connection strength for at least one of the person-to-person relationships between persons forming said one or more chains of person-to-person

Art Unit: 2153

relationships (see Kautz page 32, paragraph 24, where connection strength is considered a query for colleagues that know about certain subject matter (i.e. a strong connection strength) or colleagues of colleagues that know about certain subject matter (i.e. a weaker connection strength)).

As per claim 151, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that the search criteria include a connection threshold specified by the searcher, the connection threshold indicating a maximum number of person-to-person relationships to be allowed in establishing said one or more chains of person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential targets (see Kautz page 32, Figure 2).

As per claim 152, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that the access control criteria comprises a connection threshold indicating a maximum number of person-to-person relationships to be allowed in establishing said one or more chains of person-to-person relationships (see Kautz page 32, Figure 2).

As per claim 155, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that the matches are reported only so long as a connection between each person associated with said one or more person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential targets satisfies one attribute of the access control criteria established by a next subsequent connector in a connection path between the searcher and the potential target (see Kautz page 33, paragraph 26).

As per claim 156, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that reporting matches to searches initiated by a searcher so long as access control criteria are met further comprises autonomously brokering connections between the searcher and the potential target so as to provide information regarding the one or more persons in the one or more chains of person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential targets (see Kautz page 33, paragraph 26).

As per claim 158, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that autonomously brokering connections between the searcher and the potential target further comprises brokering, in accordance with one or more instructions supplied by any one or more connecting individuals in an inter-personal connection path from the searcher to a potential target, where such instructions refer to attributes of relationships between any two or more said persons in said chains (see Kautz page 33, paragraphs 27 and 28).

As per claim 164, Robertson in view of Kautz discloses a computer-implemented method, comprising reporting matches to search criteria specified in a search initiated by a searcher (see Robertson page 8, paragraph [103]) so long as the number of person-to-person connections in a chain of person-to-person connections connecting the searcher and a potential target is within a specified connection threshold (see Kautz page 32, paragraph 24), the specified connection threshold indicating a maximum number of person-to-person connections to be allowed in establishing said chain of person-to-person connections connecting the searcher and the potential target (see Kautz page 32, Figure 2, where maximum is considered search radius), and permission for said reporting is granted by all persons in the chain of at least three person-to-person connections connecting the searcher and the potential target to which each of the matches pertain (see Robertson page 8, paragraph [104]).

As per claim 165, Robertson in view of Kautz further discloses that the connection threshold is specified in the search criteria by the searcher (see Kautz page 32, Figure 2).

As per claims 166,174, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that it would be obvious to have the potential target establish the specified connection threshold. Robertson discloses that potential targets can establish facts that can be made available to searcher (see Fig. 9), showing that it would be obvious to allow the potential target to specify the connection threshold it would like to be found.

As per claim 169, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that matches are searched for according to degrees of trust between contacts specified through user profile criteria (see Kautz page 32, paragraph 24, where degree of trust is considered indicating a search through a colleague, or a colleague of a colleague). In considering user profile criteria, Robertson shows user profiles to hide facts about a user (see Fig. 9).

As per claim 170, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that reporting matches includes reporting information regarding individuals represented by the matches according to access control instructions provided by those individuals concerning levels of details of their personal information which may be revealed to others (see Robertson Fig. 9 and page 8, paragraph [104]).

As per claim 172, Robertson in view of Kautz disclose a computer-implemented method, comprising reporting matches to search criteria specified in a search initiated by a searcher (see Robertson page 8, paragraph [103]) so long as connection strength between each two people forming a person-to-person connection in a chain of at least three person-to-person connections between the search and a potential target exceeds a connection strength threshold (see page 32, paragraph 24, e.g. by asking what colleagues of mine know about simulated annealing a strong connection strength is implied, and by asking what colleagues of colleagues of mine know about simulated annealing implies a weaker connection strength with the target), said connection strength being an attribute of access control criteria that are selectively controllable by any of one or more persons in said chain of person-to-person connections between the searcher and the potential target (see Robertson Fig. 9); and so long as said reporting is not precluded by any of the one or more persons in the chain of person-to-person connections connecting the searcher and the potential target to which each of the matches pertain (see Robertson page 8, paragraph [104]).

As per claim 173, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that the connection strength threshold is included in the search criteria specified by the searcher (see Kautz page 32, paragraph 32).

As per claim 175, Robertson in view of Kautz further disclose that the connection strength threshold determines the minimum connection strength required between two people forming a person-to-person connection in a chain of person-to-person connections between the searcher and the potential target (see Kautz page 32, Figure 2, where showing the neighborhood within a radius implies a minimum connection strength a searcher is willing to go).

5. Claims 161,162,171 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson (US 6,092,197) as applied to claim 148 above, and further in view of Walker et al. (US 5,884,270), herein referred to as Walker, and further in view of Kautz et al. ("The Hidden Web"), herein referred to as Kautz.

As per claim 161, although the system disclosed by Robertson shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose whether a third party evaluation report is

Art Unit: 2153

accessible to the searcher, said third party evaluation report (i) pertaining to a person forming a person-to-person relationship connecting the searcher and the potential target, and (ii) being integrated with a personal profile of said person forming a person-to-person relationship connecting the searcher and the potential target.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Robertson, as evidenced by Walker.

In an analogous art, Walker discloses a system for facilitating employment searches where upon receiving criteria for candidates of interest from an employer, releasing to the employer the employment data associated with the candidates (see Abstract). Further showing that a third party evaluation report is accessible to the searcher, the third party evaluation report being integrated with a personal profile (see columns 17 and 18, lines 63-67 and 1-23).

Given the teaching of Walker, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Robertson by employing a third party evaluation report, such as disclosed by Walker, in order to verify the credentials of a possible target.

Although the system disclosed by Robertson in view of Walker shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the third party evaluation report pertains to a person forming a person-to-person relationship connecting the searcher and the potential target.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Robertson in view of Walker, as evidenced by Kautz.

In an analogous art, Kautz discloses a referral system where a person-to-person relationships are established in searching for a potential target (see page 32, paragraph 24).

Given the teaching of Kautz, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Robertson in view of Walker by having the third party evaluation report pertain to a person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential target, such as disclosed by Kautz, in order to verify the credentials of each person among the chain of person-to-person relationships connecting the searcher and the potential target.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 162, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to make the third party evaluation report inaccessible to the person that the third party evaluation report pertains in order to keep the evaluation report confidential.

As per claim 171, for the same advantages of including a third party evaluation report above, it would have been obvious for Kautz to employ third party evaluation report of the potential target in order to verify the credentials of the target. Additionally it would be obvious to include the third party evaluation report with the personal profile of the potential target in order for a searcher to easily gain access to the report.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Philip J Chea
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

PJC 3/1/06



KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER